

58



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/930,366	08/15/2001	Ki J. Yoon	2529-000070	3439
27572	7590	11/17/2004	EXAMINER	
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.			TRAN, NGHI V	
P.O. BOX 828			ART UNIT	
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303			PAPER NUMBER	
			2151	
DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

58

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/930,366

Applicant(s)

YOON ET AL.

Examiner

Nghi V Tran

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-8,22 and 23 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Interpretations

1. In claim 1, the applicant wrote, "receiving and databasing... if plural contents providers connect to a special domain name resolution server and requests a registration" (emphasis added). There are two possible occurrences for the "if" condition. The "if" condition is either TRUE or FALSE. The limitation "receiving and ... keywords" only occurs and have patentable weight if the condition claimed by applicant is TRUE. If the condition claimed by applicants is FALSE (or it does not occur), then any limitation associated with the "if" condition will not have any patentable weight.

The "if" limitation occurs many times in this application. For purpose of examination, the examiner only explains one specific claim interpretation as discussed above. All other "if" limitation will have the similar claim interpretations.

Specification

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract should be generally limited to a single paragraph within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

3. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Art Unit: 2151

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

In page 4 line 14, a phrase "FRC1035" appears to be incorrect for --RFC1035--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

5. Claims 1, 5-8, and 22-23 are objected to because of the following informalities:

With respect to claim 1, Applicants wrote, "receiving and databasing information" (emphasis added). Examiner suggests "databasing" for --storing--.

Taking claim 5 as an exemplary claim, a phrase "a specific CP on the internet" (emphasis added) appears to be unclear for --a specific content provider on the internet--. The "CP" occurs many times in this application. For purpose of examination, the examiner only explains one specific as discussed above.

Claims 6-8 and 22-23 are also objected for the same reason set forth in claim 5 above.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0087707 (hereinafter Stewart) in view of iDNS, "A Multilingual Internet" (hereinafter iDNS).

Taking claim 1 as an exemplary claim, Stewart fails to teach automatically installing the special domain name service program. However, Stewart clearly teaches a method for resolution services of special domain names, comprising steps of: step (1) of receiving and databasing information related to domain names and keywords if plural contents providers connect to a special domain name resolution server (120, 220, 320) and requests a registration (figure 6); step (2) of linking the plural contents providers (330, 340, 350) in which the special domain name server (120, 220, 320) is registered with a special domain name service program and a special domain name database information (figures 1-4); step (4) of transferring to the user's terminal an IP address corresponding to the queried domain name by identifying the domain name and a user's IP address queried to the special domain name server if the service user is connected based on the special domain name database information with the execution of the special name service program installed in step (3) (paragraph 0050, page 4; and figure 6). In domain name registration method, iDNS discloses step (3) of automatically installing the special domain name service program by downloading the special domain name service program and the special domain name database information to a terminal of a connection service user upon connecting to the contents of the contents provider (iClient, pages 3 & 5). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Stewart in view of iDNS by automatically installing the special domain name service program. The motivation for doing so would have been obvious because this feature can register any Internet

Art Unit: 2151

domain name in any language such as Chinese, Japanese, Korean, French, German, Tamil, Arabic, etc.

With respect to claim 2, Stewart further teaches the special domain name server (120, 220, 320, and 420) provides at least one of Global Load Balance (GLB) service, Server Load Balance (SLB) service, language-by-country keyword resolution service, and domain name resolution service (paragraph 0041, page 3 through paragraph 0045, page 4).

With respect to claims 3-4, Stewart further teaches the step (2) of linking the special domain name service program and the special domain name database information with the plural contents providers is to link by using object tags and corresponding object parameters in the HTML of homepage of the contents providers (paragraph 0003, page 1).

8. Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over both Stewart et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0087707 (hereinafter Stewart) and iDNS, "A Multilingual Internet" (hereinafter iDNS), and further in view of De Armas et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0110307 (hereinafter Armas).

Taking claim 12 as an exemplary claim, both Stewart and iDNS fail to teach automatically installed in an operating system of a user's PC by using the windows system message hooking technology. However, iDNS clearly teaches installed program in an operation system of a user's PC. On the other hand, Armas discloses automatically installed in an operating system of a user's PC by using the windows

Art Unit: 2151

system message hooking technology (paragraphs 0041-0042, page 4). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Stewart and iDNS in view of Armas by using the windows system message hooking technology. The motivation for doing so would have been obvious because windows system message hooking technology can be programmed to respond to certain events or react to events in a particular such as automatically installed programs in an operating system.

Claim 9-11 are also rejected for the same reason set forth in claim 12 above.

9. Claims 5-8 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over both Stewart et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0087707 (hereinafter Stewart) and iDNS, "A Multilingual Internet" (hereinafter iDNS), and further in view of De Armas et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0110307 (hereinafter Armas).

Taking claim 8 as an exemplary claim, both Stewart and iDNS fail to teach a DLL process injection method and carrying out a socket API interrupt. However, Stewart and iDNS clearly teach the special domain name service program in the step (2) includes steps of: step (2-1) of plugging in a web browser and other internet desktop application program (see iDNS, pages 3 and 5) in a subscriber PC in order to connect to a specific CP on the internet or executing the special domain name service program for directly connecting to the special domain name server (see Stewart, paragraph 0003, page 1); step (2-2) of calling the domain name from the web browser or the other internet desktop application program for the connection to the CP (see Stewart, figures

5-9); step (2-4) of identifying whether the domain name information exists in the special domain name database (see Stewart, paragraph 0003, page 1); step (2-5) of carrying out a query about the special domain name to a corresponding special domain name server associated to the contents providers existing in the special domain name database if present as a result of the identification of step (2-4) (see Stewart, figures 5-9); step (2-6) of connecting to a contents server resolved in step (2-5) (see Stewart, figures 5-9); and step (2-7) of connecting to a pre-set local DNS server if absent as a result of the identification of step (2-4) (see iDNS, page 1). On the other hand, Armas discloses a DLL process injection method (figure 5) in step (2-1); and a step (2-3) of carrying out a socket API interrupt (). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Stewart and iDNS in view of Armas by using DLL process injection method and carrying out a socket API interrupt. The motivation for doing so would have been obvious because these features enable automatically installing program in operating system, and making the process smooth and reliable for the end-user as relating to the domain name to be sent to a DNS.

Claims 5-7 and 22-23 are also rejected for the same reason set forth in claim 8 above.

10. Claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over both Stewart et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0087707 (hereinafter Stewart) and iDNS, "A Multilingual Internet" (hereinafter iDNS), and further

Art Unit: 2151

in view of De Armas et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0110307 (hereinafter Armas).

Taking claim 16 as an exemplary claim, both Stewart and iDNS fail to teach automatically installed in an operating system of a user's PC by using the windows system message hooking technology. However, iDNS clearly teaches installed program in an operation system of a user's PC. On the other hand, Armas discloses automatically installed in an operating system of a user's PC by using the windows system message hooking technology (paragraphs 0041-0042, page 4). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Stewart and iDNS in view of Armas by using the windows system message hooking technology. The motivation for doing so would have been obvious because windows system message hooking technology can be programmed to respond to certain events or react to events in a particular such as automatically installed programs in an operating system.

Claims 13-15 are also rejected for the same reason set forth in claim 16 above.

11. Claims 17-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over both Stewart et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0087707 (hereinafter Stewart) and iDNS, "A Multilingual Internet" (hereinafter iDNS), and further in view of Larsson et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,327,705 (hereinafter Larsson).

Taking claim 17 as an exemplary claim, both Stewart and iDNS fail to teach requesting the re-installation of the components in case that the version is not appropriate by checking whether the version of the installed components are

Art Unit: 2151

appropriate. However, iDNS clearly discloses the step (3) for downloading the special domain name service program and the special domain name database information to the user's terminal by the contents providers. On the other hand, Larsson discloses step (3-1) of checking by the contents providers whether the special domain name service program is installed when the user is connected (figures 6A & 6B); step (3-2) of requesting the installation of components in an appropriate version for the system if the components are not installed in step (3-1) (figure 6A & 6B); and (3-3) of requesting the re-installation of the components in case that the version is not appropriate by checking whether the version of the installed components are appropriate (figure 6A and 6B; and column 11, line 54 through column 12, line 19). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify both Stewart and iDNS in view of Larsson by reinstalling of the components. The motivation for doing so would have been obvious because this feature enable a maintenance update for the application program and automatically installing when the components are not exists.

Claim 18-19 and 21 are also rejected for the same reason set forth in claim 17 above.

12. Claims 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0087707 (hereinafter Stewart) and iDNS, "A Multilingual Internet" (hereinafter iDNS), and De Armas et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0110307 (hereinafter Armas), and further in view of Larsson et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,327,705 (hereinafter Larsson).

With respect to claim 20, Stewart, iDNS, and Armas fail to teach requesting the re-installation of the components in case that the version is not appropriate by checking whether the version of the installed components are appropriate. However, iDNS and Armas clearly disclose the step (3) for downloading the special domain name service program and the special domain name database information to the user's terminal by the contents providers. On the other hand, Larsson discloses step (3-1) of checking by the contents providers whether the special domain name service program is installed when the user is connected (figures 6A & 6B); step (3-2) of requesting the installation of components in an appropriate version for the system if the components are not installed in step (3-1) (figure 6A & 6B); and (3-3) of requesting the re-installation of the components in case that the version is not appropriate by checking whether the version of the installed components are appropriate (figure 6A and 6B; and column 11, line 54 through column 12, line 19). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify both Stewart and iDNS in view of Larsson by reinstalling of the components. The motivation for doing so would have been obvious because this feature enable a maintenance update for the application program and automatically installing when the components are not exists.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2151

- a. "Method and apparatus for performing automated trademark and domain name correlation," by Kofsky, U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0099693.
- b. "Internet domain name registration system," by Fellman, U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0065903.
- c. "Method and apparatus for dynamic interval-based load balancing," by Yu, U.S. Patent Number 6,078,943.
- d. "WorldName, Inc. Provides Multilingual Technology to Network Solution for .com, .net and .org Registration Services," December 07, 2000, WorldName, Inc., <http://www.worldnames.net/press/pressreleases.cfm>.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nghi V Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-4067. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nghi V Tran
Examiner
Art Unit 2151

NT


ZARNI MAUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER